



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/743,313	12/23/2003	Hye-won Yang	Q79032	5574
23373 7590 11/04/2008 SUGHRUE MION, PLLC 2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W. SUITE 800 WASHINGTON, DC 20037			EXAMINER THERIAULT, STEVEN B	
			ART UNIT 2179	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 11/04/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

**Advisory Action**  
**Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

**Application No.**

10/743,313

**Applicant(s)**

YANG, HYE-WON

**Examiner**

STEVEN B. THERIAULT

**Art Unit**

2179

***--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --***

THE REPLY FILED 20 October 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires \_\_\_\_\_ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**NOTICE OF APPEAL**

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

**AMENDMENTS**

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because  
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);  
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or  
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).  
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.  
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).  
7. ☐ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.  
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  
Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.  
Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.  
Claim(s) rejected: \_\_\_\_\_.  
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

**AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE**

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).  
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).  
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

**REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER**

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  
See Continuation Sheet.  
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_  
13. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

/Steven B Theriault/  
Patent Examiner  
Art Unit: 2179

Continuation of 11, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The applicant's request for reconsideration has been carefully reviewed and is not persuasive for the following reasons: The examiner refers to MPEP 2123 that states that an entire reference cited is considered relevant to the rejection and not just the cited sections. Meaning a reference to specific paragraphs, columns, pages, or figures in a cited prior art reference is not limited to preferred embodiments or any specific examples. It is well settled that a prior art reference, in its entirety, must be considered for all that it expressly teaches and fairly suggests to one having ordinary skill in the art. Stated differently, a prior art disclosure reading on a limitation of Applicant's claim cannot be ignored on the ground that other embodiments disclosed were instead cited. Therefore, the Examiner's citation to a specific portion of a single prior art reference is not intended to exclusively dictate, but rather, to demonstrate an exemplary disclosure commensurate with the specific limitations being addressed. In regard to claim 1, the applicant's arguments state the Kodimer in view of Goldstein do not teach or suggest that the claimed clipboard unit displays data, including a plurality of items stored in the multi-clipboard. Further applicants second argument appears to assert the examiner confuses the teachings of Kodimer because it appears that the clipboard relied upon by the examiner cannot be both a multi-clipboard and a basic clipboard. In this case addressing the first argument, the examiner's reasoning is based on a broad interpretation of the phrase "data" as represented in the claims. The applicant has cited the correct section as to what Kodimer states the use of indicators to indicate the kind of data in the clipboard. Column 7, lines 60-67 state the indicators can be text, to which a possible scenario in Kodimer is that the buffer contains text and the actual text can be displayed. Alternatively, the use of thumbnails can show a depiction of what is in the buffer. In both scenarios, the data when broadly construed will be shown. In the second argument, the Examiner responds with the following scenario: Using figure 6d and 8b a scenario or interpretation of the cut/copy command and the paste command in the claim is two separate commands because the claim states the user selects paste and copy/cut at different times. Therefore, using the figures as an example and the stated teaching in Kodimer that a new buffer is allocated automatically (See column 5, lines 39-50), where the application 2 has has only one. The user can select application two and cut/copy from the first slot of the clipboard for application two. The system will then allocate an unused or basic buffer to application two and the user can modify what is shown on the screen into the unused second spot that is automatically allocated by the system and pasted into the second slot when the user indicates the second command. The outcome would be the latest copy would be stored in the new basic clipboard that would then become a part of the multiclipboard. Alternative scenarios can exist where the second application does not have any data pasted to the clipboard as of yet, then the user copies from one application and indicates the information is to be posted to another. The system would have a basic slot for the application without clipboard data. Then upon the command data would first be stored in the basic, automatically generated buffer slot. The clipboard at this state would include just one slot and would not be considered a multi-clipboard as of yet. Then the user can select a second piece of data to copy to the application with one slot. The system automatically generates new slot, the second data could then be copied to the second slot and the user can designate the information be assigned to the slot. The already stored information in a slot would then be considered the other data and the latest data is now stored in the clipboard. The assignment to the clipboard and second slot makes the clipboard a multi-clipboard. Further examples, could use three or four applications to accomplish the same goal. The key here is that one interpretation of the claim allows for separate commands to execute the paste by the user. Perhaps applicant can further differentiate both the commands and the interface of figure 7&8 from the prior art to forward prosecution. .